

MAXIMA OF MOVING SUMS IN A POISSON RANDOM FIELD

BY HOCK PENG CHAN

National University of Singapore

Abstract

The extremal tail probabilities of moving sums in a marked Poisson random field is examined here. These sums are computed by adding up the weighted occurrences of events lying within a scanning set of fixed shape and size. Change of measure and analysis of local random fields are used to provide tail probabilities. The asymptotic constants are initially expressed in a form that seems hard to evaluate and do not seem to provide any additional information on the properties of the constants. A more sophisticated approach is then undertaken giving rise to an expression that is not only neater but also able to provide computable bounds. The technique used to obtain this constant can also be modified to work on continuous processes.

Abbreviated Title: MAXIMA OF POISSON MOVING SUMS

Supported by grants from the National University of Singapore.

AMS 2000 *subject classifications*. Primary; 60F10; secondary 60G10, 60G55.

Key words and phrases. Change of measure, large deviations, marked Poisson process, moving sums, Poisson clumping, scan statistics.

1. Introduction. The maxima of moving averages in Gaussian random fields in dimension $d > 1$ was studied in Siegmund and Worsley (1995) and Shafie, Sigal, Siegmund and Worsley (2003), with applications in imaging and signal detection. Two key techniques used are (i) the Karhunen-Loève expansion with the volume of tube formula and (ii) the Euler characteristic; see Adler (2000) for an overview of the research area and also Taylor, Takemura and Adler (2005) and Taylor (2006) for more recent developments.

The maximum of moving sums in Poisson random fields, more commonly known as scan statistics in the statistical literature, also have widespread applications in molecular biology, epidemiology, geostatistics and image analysis, cf. Cressie (1993), Anderson and Titterton (1997), Glaz, Naus and Wallenstein (2001) and Chan and Zhang (2007), but the tail probability approximations are in comparison not as well developed for $d > 1$. While the tail probabilities of these sums have been studied in Naus (1965), Loader (1991) and Alm (1997), restrictions to rectangular scanning sets have been imposed for analytical convenience.

We set out here to study the tail probabilities of the maxima of moving sums with minimal restrictions on the choice of scanning sets. A theory parallel to the study of tail probabilities in Gaussian or Gaussian-like random fields in the classical framework of Pickands (1969), Bickel and Rosenblatt (1973), Qualls and Watanabe (1973), Piterbarg (1996) and Chan and Lai (2006) is developed here. We also consider a more general marked Poisson random field, which is motivated by recent developments in molecular biology, see for example Chan and Zhang (2007). This generalization entails careful consideration of overshoots in special cases of scanning sets that is not required in Poisson random fields. Berman (1982) and Albin (1990) have also studied tail probabilities of stationary processes but their limiting results are of a different type and do not apply here.

The first expression of the tail probability is stated in Theorem 1 in Section 3. Lemma 1 is the basic building block of Theorem 1, providing the extremal tail probability over a local domain by using a change of measure approach. The expression of this tail probability requires a description of an induced local random field around the boundary of the scanning set and this is provided in Section 2. The technical details of how these building blocks can be combined together to provide the tail probability of the maxima of the sums over the whole domain, via an adaption of the Pickands-Qualls-Watanabe technique, is given in the Appendix. In Section 4, we provide an alternative expression of the asymptotic constants in Theorem 1 via a more refined technique and obtain bounds of these constants. In Section 5, we adapt this technique on continuous valued random fields and show that it provide constants that looks like a differential form of the constants obtained via the beautiful Poisson

clumping heuristic shown in Aldous (1989). Some bounds obtained from the new expression are surprisingly accurate.

2. Definitions, notations and a local Poisson random field. Let D and B be Jordan-measurable (bounded) subsets of $\mathbf{R}^d$. For vectors $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, \dots, t_d)$ and $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_d)$, we shall use the notation $\mathbf{t} \succ \mathbf{u}$ to denote $t_j \geq u_j$ for all j . We shall also let $\mathbf{0} = (0, \dots, 0)$ and $\mathbf{1} = (1, \dots, 1)$. Let $\sigma_k(\cdot)$, $k = d$ or $k = d - 1$ denote the k -dimensional volume of a k -dimensional manifold in $\mathbf{R}^d$. For any $A \subset \mathbf{R}^d$, $b \in \mathbf{R}$ and $c \in \mathbf{R}^d$, we shall let $\#A$ denote the number of elements in A and $c + bA = \{c + ba : a \in A\}$. We shall also use $\|\cdot\|$ to denote L_2 -norm and $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ to denote L_∞ -norm.

Assume that the boundary ∂B can be expressed as a finite union of smooth $(d - 1)$ -dimensional submanifolds possibly with boundary (see Spivak (1965) p113 for the definition). For example, if $B = \{\mathbf{t} : \|\mathbf{t}\|_\infty \leq 1\}$, a cube of length 2, then ∂B is a union of $2d$ faces, each a smooth $(d - 1)$ -dimensional submanifold with boundary.

Let $\mathbf{X} = \{(\mathbf{t}_i, X_i) : i \geq 1\}$ be a marked point process on $\mathbf{R}^{d+1}$, characterized by F , a distribution function of the marks X_i and $\lambda > 0$, the rate of events occurring. Hence for any set A , Borel subset of $\mathbf{R}^{d+1}$, $\#\{i : (\mathbf{t}_i, X_i) \in A\}$ follows a Poisson distribution with mean $\lambda \int_A d\mathbf{t} \times dF(x)$. Moreover, for any two disjoint Borel sets A and C , $\#\{i : (\mathbf{t}_i, X_i) \in A\}$ and $\#\{i : (\mathbf{t}_i, X_i) \in C\}$ are independent random variables. From the above description, we may assume without loss of generality that $X_1, X_2, \dots$ are independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) random variables having distribution F and independent of $\{\mathbf{t}_i : i \geq 1\}$; a Poisson process with rate λ .

Let $\mu = EX_1$ and $M(\theta) = Ee^{\theta X_1}$. Assume that $P\{X_1 > 0\} > 0$ and $\Theta := \{\theta : M(\theta) < \infty\}$ is an open neighborhood of 0. For any set A , Borel subset of $\mathbf{R}^d$, define the sum $S(A) = \sum_{\mathbf{t}_i \in A} X_i$. We analyze here the tail probability

$$(2.1) \quad p_\lambda := P_\lambda \left\{ \sup_{\mathbf{v} \in D} S(\mathbf{v} + B) \geq \lambda c \right\}$$

as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$, for given $c > \max\{0, \mu\sigma_d(B)\}$.

Through an appropriate transformation, we can also look at the limiting probability of p_λ as one involving fixed Poisson rate $\lambda_0 > 0$ and increasingly large scanning sets. Let $g_\lambda = (\lambda/\lambda_0)^{1/d}$ be the scaling constants. Then $p_\lambda = P_{\lambda_0} \{ \sup_{\mathbf{v} \in g_\lambda D} S(\mathbf{v} + g_\lambda B) \geq \lambda c \}$. For notational simplicity, the analysis here looks at p_λ in terms of (2.1) but the presence of such transformations has important practical implications.

We will now proceed with the description of a limiting local random field $\mathbf{Y} = \{Y(\mathbf{u}) :$

$\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{R}\}$, that is derived from both the distribution F and the geometry of the boundary ∂B . For a given $c > \max\{0, \mu\sigma_d(B)\}$, let $\theta_c > 0$ and distribution F_c satisfy

$$(2.2) \quad M'(\theta_c) = c/\sigma_d(B) \text{ and } F_c(dx) = e^{\theta_c x} F(dx)/M(\theta_c),$$

where $'$ here denotes first derivative.

Let $\mathbf{Z}^{(1)} = \{(\mathbf{v}_i^{(1)}, Z_i^{(1)}) : i \geq 1\}$ be a marked Poisson process such that $\{\mathbf{v}_i^{(1)} : i \geq 1\}$ is a Poisson process with rate 1 on the domain $\partial B \times [0, \infty)$ and $Z_1^{(1)}, Z_2^{(1)}, \dots$ are i.i.d. with distribution F . Let $\mathbf{Z}^{(2)} = \{(\mathbf{v}_i^{(2)}, Z_i^{(2)}) : i \geq 1\}$ be a marked Poisson process independent of $\mathbf{Z}^{(1)}$, such that $\{\mathbf{v}_i^{(2)} : i \geq 1\}$ is a Poisson process with rate $M(\theta_c)$ on the domain $\partial B \times (-\infty, 0)$ and $Z_1^{(2)}, Z_2^{(2)}, \dots$ are i.i.d. with distribution F_c . Let $\mathbf{n}_{\mathbf{t}}$ be the unit normal vector of $\mathbf{t} \in \partial B$ away from B and let $\cdot$ denote dot product. For $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{R}^d$, let

$$(2.3) \quad \begin{aligned} Y^{(j)}(\mathbf{u}) &= \sum_{i: \mathbf{v}_i^{(j)} \in A_{\mathbf{u}}^{(j)}} Z_i^{(j)} \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \text{ where} \\ A_{\mathbf{u}}^{(1)} &= \bigcup_{\mathbf{t} \in \partial B: \mathbf{n}_{\mathbf{t}} \cdot \mathbf{u} > 0} \mathbf{t} \times [0, \mathbf{n}_{\mathbf{t}} \cdot \mathbf{u}) \text{ and } A_{\mathbf{u}}^{(2)} = \bigcup_{\mathbf{t} \in \partial B: \mathbf{n}_{\mathbf{t}} \cdot \mathbf{u} < 0} \mathbf{t} \times [\mathbf{n}_{\mathbf{t}} \cdot \mathbf{u}, 0). \end{aligned}$$

We define

$$(2.4) \quad Y(\mathbf{u}) = Y^{(1)}(\mathbf{u}) - Y^{(2)}(\mathbf{u}) \text{ for all } \mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{R}^d.$$

3. First expression of asymptotic tail probability. A key idea here is a change of measure argument that allows us to obtain, in Lemma 1, the tail probability of the maxima over a local domain. To obtain the global probabilities in Theorem 1 from these local probabilities, we adapt the Pickands-Quall-Watanabe technique from the Gaussian random field literature. Hence the characterization of the constant K in Theorem 1 bears a striking resemblance to constants seen in the earlier papers on Gaussian random fields though the distribution of $Y(\mathbf{u})$ here is compound Poisson rather than Gaussian.

Let Q_λ be a probability measure under which $\mathbf{X}$ is a nonhomogeneous marked Poisson process with rate $\lambda M(\theta_c)$ and mark distribution F_c inside B , and rate λ and mark distribution F outside B . Hence under Q_λ , for any set A , Borel subset of $\mathbf{R}^{d+1}$, $\#\{i : (\mathbf{t}_i, X_i) \in A\}$ follows a Poisson distribution with mean $\lambda M(\theta_c) \int_{A \cap (B \times \mathbf{R})} d\mathbf{t} \times dF_c(x) + \lambda \int_{A \cap (B^c \times \mathbf{R})} d\mathbf{t} \times dF(x)$ while $\#\{i : (\mathbf{t}_i, X_i) \in A\}$ and $\#\{i : (\mathbf{t}_i, X_i) \in C\}$ are independent random variables for disjoint sets A and C . By (2.2),

$$(3.1) \quad \frac{dQ_\lambda}{dP_\lambda}(\mathbf{X}) = \exp\{\theta_c S(B) - \lambda \sigma_d(B)[M(\theta_c) - 1]\}.$$

Let $E_{\mathbf{t},m,\lambda} = \{\sup_{\mathbf{t} \prec \mathbf{v} \prec \mathbf{t} + m\lambda^{-1}\mathbf{1}} S(\mathbf{v} + B) \geq \lambda c\}$. In the proof of Lemma 1 below, we analyze the event $E_{\mathbf{0},m,\lambda}$ under Q_λ before applying the identity $P_\lambda(E_{\mathbf{0},m,\lambda}) = E_{Q_\lambda}[(dP_\lambda/dQ_\lambda)\mathbf{1}_{E_{\mathbf{0},m,\lambda}}]$. We shall now define some terms required for the statement of Lemma 1.

For given $c > \max\{0, \mu\sigma_d(B)\}$, let

$$(3.2) \quad I(= I_c) = \theta_c c - \sigma_d(B)[M(\theta_c) - 1].$$

It follows from Theorem 1 below that $I = -\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \lambda^{-1} \log p_\lambda$ and hence I is the large deviation rate of the tail probability. If there exists $\eta > 0$ such that F is concentrated on $\pm\eta, \pm 2\eta, \dots$, then we say that F is arithmetic. The largest η with this property will be called the span of F , cf. Feller (1971) Section 5.2. If such η does not exist, then we say that F is nonarithmetic. Let $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ denote the greatest integer function and $''$ the second derivative of a function.

LEMMA 1. *Let $c > \max\{0, \mu\sigma_d(B)\}$. Define $x_\lambda = \theta_c(\lambda c - \eta \lfloor \lambda c / \eta \rfloor)$ if F is arithmetic with span η and $x_\lambda = 0$ if F is nonarithmetic. Then for all $\mathbf{t} \in D$,*

$$(3.3) \quad P_\lambda(E_{\mathbf{t},m,\lambda}) = P_\lambda(E_{\mathbf{0},m,\lambda}) \sim [2\pi\lambda\sigma_d(B)M''(\theta_c)]^{-1/2} e^{-\lambda I + x_\lambda} K_m \text{ as } \lambda \rightarrow \infty,$$

where

$$(3.4) \quad K_m = \begin{cases} \eta \left[(1 - e^{-\eta\theta_c})^{-1} + \sum_{\ell \in \eta\mathbf{Z}^+} e^{\theta_c \ell} P\{\sup_{\mathbf{0} \prec \mathbf{u} \prec m\mathbf{1}} Y(\mathbf{u}) \geq \ell\} \right] & \text{if } F \text{ is arithmetic with span } \eta, \\ \theta_c^{-1} + \int_0^\infty e^{\theta_c y} P\{\sup_{\mathbf{0} \prec \mathbf{u} \prec m\mathbf{1}} Y(\mathbf{u}) \geq y\} dy & \text{if } F \text{ is nonarithmetic.} \end{cases}$$

PROOF. By stationarity, $P_\lambda(E_{\mathbf{t},m,\lambda}) = P_\lambda(E_{\mathbf{0},m,\lambda})$. Let us first consider the case F arithmetic with span 1. Then

$$(3.5) \quad \begin{aligned} P_\lambda(E_{\mathbf{0},m,\lambda}) &= P_\lambda\left\{ \sup_{\mathbf{0} \prec \mathbf{v} \prec m\lambda^{-1}\mathbf{1}} S(\mathbf{v} + B) \geq \lambda c \right\} \\ &= P_\lambda\{S(B) \geq \lfloor \lambda c \rfloor\} + \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} P_\lambda\{S(B) = \lfloor \lambda c \rfloor - \ell, \sup_{\mathbf{0} \prec \mathbf{v} \prec m\lambda^{-1}\mathbf{1}} [S(\mathbf{v} + B) - S(B)] \geq \ell\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $B_a = \bigcap_{\mathbf{0} \prec \mathbf{v} \prec a\mathbf{1}} (\mathbf{v} + B)$. Since $S(B \setminus B_{m\lambda^{-1}})$ and $\sup_{\mathbf{0} \prec \mathbf{v} \prec m\lambda^{-1}\mathbf{1}} [S(\mathbf{v} + B) - S(B)]$ are functions of the marked Poisson process occurring outside $B_{m\lambda^{-1}}$ and hence independent of

$S(B_{m\lambda^{-1}})$ under Q_λ , it follows from (3.1) that

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.6) \quad & P_\lambda\{S(B) = \lfloor \lambda c \rfloor - \ell, \sup_{\mathbf{0} \prec \mathbf{v} \prec m\lambda^{-1}\mathbf{1}} [S(\mathbf{v} + B) - S(B)] \geq \ell\} \\
& = e^{-\lambda I + x_\lambda + \theta_c \ell} Q_\lambda\{S(B) = \lfloor \lambda c \rfloor - \ell, \sup_{\mathbf{0} \prec \mathbf{v} \prec m\lambda^{-1}\mathbf{1}} [S(\mathbf{v} + B) - S(B)] \geq \ell\} \\
& = e^{-\lambda I + x_\lambda + \theta_c \ell} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} Q_\lambda\{S(B_{m\lambda^{-1}}) = \lfloor \lambda c \rfloor - \ell - k\} \\
& \quad \times Q_\lambda\{S(B \setminus B_{m\lambda^{-1}}) = k, \sup_{\mathbf{0} \prec \mathbf{v} \prec m\lambda^{-1}\mathbf{1}} [S(\mathbf{v} + B) - S(B)] \geq \ell\}.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows from the local central limit theorem that for each $\ell \in \mathbf{Z}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.7) \quad & Q_\lambda\{S(B_{m\lambda^{-1}}) = \lfloor \lambda c \rfloor - \ell - k\} \leq [1 + o(1)] Q_\lambda\{S(B) = \lfloor \lambda c \rfloor - \ell\} \\
& \sim [2\pi\lambda\sigma_d(B)M''(\theta_c)]^{-1/2} \text{ as } \lambda \rightarrow \infty,
\end{aligned}$$

uniformly over $k \geq 0$, with $\leq$ replaced by $=$ if we look at (3.7) with k fixed. Hence by (3.6) and (3.7),

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.8) \quad & P_\lambda\{S(B) = \lfloor \lambda c \rfloor - \ell, \sup_{\mathbf{0} \prec \mathbf{v} \prec m\lambda^{-1}\mathbf{1}} [S(\mathbf{v} + B) - S(B)] \geq \ell\} \\
& \sim [2\pi\lambda\sigma_d(B)M''(\theta_c)]^{-1/2} e^{-\lambda I + x_\lambda + \theta_c \ell} Q_\lambda\left\{\sup_{\mathbf{0} \prec \mathbf{v} \prec m\lambda^{-1}\mathbf{1}} [S(\mathbf{v} + B) - S(B)] \geq \ell\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

By (3.8) and the weak convergence of $\{S(\lambda^{-1}\mathbf{u} + B) - S(B) : \mathbf{0} \prec \mathbf{u} \prec m\mathbf{1}\}$ under Q_λ to $\{Y(\mathbf{u}) : \mathbf{0} \prec \mathbf{u} \prec m\mathbf{1}\}$ as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$; see (2.3) and (2.4),

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.9) \quad & \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} P_\lambda\{S(B) = \lfloor \lambda c \rfloor - \ell, \sup_{\mathbf{0} \prec \mathbf{v} \prec m\lambda^{-1}\mathbf{1}} [S(\mathbf{v} + B) - S(B)] \geq \ell\} \\
& \sim e^{-\lambda I + x_\lambda} [2\pi\lambda\sigma_d(B)M''(\theta_c)]^{-1/2} \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} e^{\theta_c \ell} P\left\{\sup_{\mathbf{0} \prec \mathbf{u} \prec m\mathbf{1}} Y(\mathbf{u}) \geq \ell\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

By a similar application of (3.1) and (3.7),

$$(3.10) \quad P_\lambda\{S(B) \geq \lfloor \lambda c \rfloor\} \sim [2\pi\lambda\sigma_d(B)M''(\theta_c)]^{-1/2} e^{-\lambda I + x_\lambda} \sum_{\ell=-\infty}^0 e^{\theta_c \ell}.$$

Substitution of (3.9) and (3.10) into (3.5) then proves Lemma 1 when F is arithmetic with span 1. For F arithmetic with arbitrary span η , we prove Lemma 1 by replacing the sums in (3.5), (3.6), (3.9) and (3.10) by $\sum_{\ell \in \eta\mathbf{Z}^+}$, $\sum_{k \geq 0, k \in \eta\mathbf{Z}}$ or $\sum_{\ell \leq 0, \ell \in \eta\mathbf{Z}}$. For nonarithmetic F , the sums are replaced by corresponding integrals. The detailed arguments are similar to the proof above and shall be omitted. $\square$

THEOREM 1. Let $c > \max\{0, \mu\sigma_d(B)\}$ and define x_λ as in Lemma 1. Then

$$(3.11) \quad K := \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} m^{-d} K_m \text{ is a well-defined positive and finite constant.}$$

Moreover,

$$(3.12) \quad p_\lambda = P_\lambda\{\sup_{\mathbf{v} \in D} S(\mathbf{v} + B) \geq \lambda c\} \sim [2\pi\sigma_d(B)M''(\theta_c)]^{-1/2} e^{-\lambda I + x_\lambda} \lambda^{d-1/2} \sigma_d(D) K \text{ as } \lambda \rightarrow \infty.$$

REMARKS. By Jordan measurability of D ,

$$(3.13) \quad \#\left\{\mathbf{k} \in (a\mathbf{Z})^d : \prod_{j=1}^d [k_j, k_j + a) \subset D\right\} \sim \#\left\{\mathbf{k} \in (a\mathbf{Z})^d : \prod_{j=1}^d [k_j, k_j + a) \cap D \neq \emptyset\right\} \text{ as } a \rightarrow 0.$$

The relation (3.12) still holds if D is replaced by domains D_λ that depends on λ , provided (3.13) holds with D replaced by D_λ and a replaced by $m\lambda^{-1}$, with limit $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ for all large m , and

$$(3.14) \quad \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \lambda^{-1} \log[\sigma_d(D_\lambda)] = 0.$$

Without condition (3.14), the correct relation is

$$P_\lambda\{\sup_{\mathbf{v} \in D_\lambda} S(\mathbf{v} + B) \geq \lambda c\} \sim 1 - \exp\{-[2\pi\sigma_d(B)M''(\theta_c)]^{-1/2} e^{-\lambda I + x_\lambda} \lambda^{d-1/2} \sigma_d(D_\lambda) K\}.$$

We will now discuss an interesting case of Theorem 1. In Example 1, we consider rectangular scanning sets on a marked Poisson random field. We show here that an overshoot constant derived from F plays an important role in the tail approximations. When F is degenerate at 1, that is for Poisson random fields rather than marked Poisson random fields, the overshoot constant is equal to 1 and disappears from the resulting formula.

EXAMPLE 1. Let $B = \prod_{k=1}^d [0, b_k]$ with $b_k > 0$ for all k . Since ∂B is a union of $2d$ faces, with a pair of them orthogonal to each co-ordinate vector, by (2.3) and (2.4), $Y(\mathbf{u}) = \sum_{k=1}^d [Y_k^{(1)}(u_k) - Y_k^{(2)}(u_k)]$, where $Y_1^{(1)}, \dots, Y_d^{(1)}, Y_1^{(2)}, \dots, Y_d^{(2)}$ are independent one-dimensional compound point processes. The process $Y_k^{(1)}$, $1 \leq k \leq d$, is constructed from a marked Poisson process having Poisson rate $\prod_{\ell \neq k} b_\ell$; the surface area of the face of B orthogonal to the k th co-ordinate vector, and mark distribution F . The process $Y_k^{(2)}$, $1 \leq k \leq d$, is constructed from a marked Poisson process with Poisson rate $M(\theta_c) \prod_{\ell \neq k} b_\ell$ and mark distribution F_c . If X is a random variable with distribution F_c , we shall let $\bar{F}_c$ denote

the distribution of $-X$. We define $\bar{F}$ in a similar manner. Consider first F nonarithmetic and let $Y_k = Y_k^{(1)} - Y_k^{(2)}$. Then by (3.4) and $P\{\sup_{\mathbf{0} \prec \mathbf{u} \prec m \mathbf{1}} [\sum_{k=1}^d Y_k(u_k)] \geq y\} = 1$ for $y \leq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} K_m &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{\theta_c y} P\left\{ \sup_{\mathbf{0} \prec \mathbf{u} \prec m \mathbf{1}} \left[\sum_{k=1}^d Y_k(u_k) \right] \geq y \right\} dy \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left(\int_{-\infty}^y e^{\theta_c u} du \right) P\left\{ \sup_{\mathbf{0} \prec \mathbf{u} \prec m \mathbf{1}} \left[\sum_{k=1}^d Y_k(u_k) \right] \in dy \right\} = \theta_c^{-1} E \exp \left[\theta_c \sum_{k=1}^d \sup_{0 \leq u_k \leq m} Y_k(u_k) \right] \\ &= \theta_c^{-1} \prod_{k=1}^d E \exp[\theta_c \sup_{0 \leq u_k \leq m} Y_k(u_k)] = \theta_c^{d-1} \prod_{k=1}^d \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{\theta_c y} P\left\{ \sup_{0 \leq u_k \leq m} Y_k(u_k) \geq y \right\} dy. \end{aligned}$$

Since $Y_k^{(1)}$ and $Y_k^{(2)}$ are independent compound Poisson processes, it follows that $Y_k(u_k) = \sum_{j=1}^{N_k(u_k)} U_{kj}$, where N_k is a Poisson process with rate $(\prod_{\ell \neq k} b_\ell)[1 + M(\theta_c)]$ and $U_{k1}, U_{k2}, \dots$ are i.i.d. random variables independent of N_k such that

$$(3.16) \quad P\{U_{k1} \in du\} = [M(\theta_c)\bar{F}_c(du) + F(du)]/[1 + M(\theta_c)].$$

Let P_* be a probability measure under which the distribution of N_k is unchanged and $U_{k1}, U_{k2}, \dots$ are i.i.d. random variables independent of N_k satisfying

$$(3.17) \quad P_*\{U_{k1} \in du\} = [\bar{F}(du) + M(\theta_c)F_c(du)]/[1 + M(\theta_c)].$$

By (2.2), (3.16) and (3.17),

$$(3.18) \quad (dP_*/dP)(U_{k1}) = e^{\theta_c U_{k1}}.$$

Suppressing the notation k , let $R_\ell = U_1 + \dots + U_\ell$ and $\tau_y = \inf\{\ell \geq 1 : R_\ell \geq y\}$. Define the overshoot constant

$$(3.19) \quad \nu_c = \lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} E_* e^{-\theta_c(R_{\tau_y} - y)},$$

where E_* denotes expectation with respect to P_* . See Siegmund (1985) Chapter 8 for the existence and computation of ν_c . By (3.17)-(3.19),

$$\begin{aligned} (3.20) \quad & \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{\theta_c y} P\left\{ \sup_{0 \leq u_k \leq m} Y_k(u_k) \geq y \right\} dy = \theta_c^{-1} + \int_0^{\infty} E_*[e^{\theta_c(y - R_{\tau_y})} \mathbf{1}_{\{\sup_{0 \leq u_k \leq m} Y_k(u_k) \geq y\}}] dy \\ & \sim \nu_c E_*\left[\sup_{0 \leq u_k \leq m} Y_k(u_k) \right] \sim \nu_c m [c\sigma_d^{-1}(B) - \mu] \prod_{\ell \neq k} b_\ell, \end{aligned}$$

noting that by (2.2), under F_c , $E_c X_1 = M'(\theta_c)/M(\theta_c) = c/[\sigma_d(B)M(\theta_c)]$ and by definition, under F , $EX_1 = \mu$. Substituting (3.20) into (3.15) and (3.11), (3.12) then gives us

$$(3.21) \quad p_\lambda \sim [2\pi\sigma_d(B)M''(\theta_c)]^{-1/2} e^{-\lambda I + x_\lambda} \lambda^{d-1/2} \sigma_d(D) \{\nu_c [c\sigma_d^{-1}(B) - \mu]\}^d \left(\chi_c \prod_{k=1}^d b_k \right)^{d-1},$$

c	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	∞
(I) F concentrated at 1	.160	.497	.818	1.08	1.29	1.47	1.62	1.75	1.85	3.12
Lower bound of (I)	.0235	.0795	.137	.188	.232	.268	.299	.325	.348	.636
(II) $F \sim N(0, 1)$	.153	.324	.495	.654	.797	.929	1.04	1.15	1.25	3.12

Table 1: Entries of $K/(1+c)^2$ for the second row and $K\theta_c/[1+M(\theta_c)]^2$ for the fourth row for the kernel $B = \{\mathbf{t} : \|\mathbf{t}\| \leq 1\}$ with $d = 2$. These numbers have an approximate 1% numerical error. The third row is obtained from the inequality $K \geq 2(c-1)^3/[\pi(1+c)]$, see Example 2.

where $\chi_c = \theta_c$ when F is nonarithmetic. Using similar arguments, the relation (3.21) can also be shown to hold for F arithmetic with span η , by defining ν_c in (3.19) with limit $y \in \eta\mathbf{Z}$, $y \rightarrow \infty$ and $\chi_c = \eta^{-1}(1 - e^{-\eta\theta_c})$.

4. An alternative approach. The evaluation of the constant K in Example 1 for rectangular kernels follows along the lines of Hogan and Siegmund (1986). However, when B is not rectangular, the expression of K via (3.4) and (3.11) does not seem to be helpful except for indicating how the proofs of Lemma 1 and Theorem 1 is expected to proceed. This is unsatisfying since kernels of other shapes are often used in practice. For example, in epidemiology and geostatistical applications, the circular kernel $B = \{(t_1, t_2) : t_1^2 + t_2^2 \leq 1\}$ provides a more desirable co-ordinate free space symmetry. For space-time problems, the corresponding kernel is the cylindrical scanning set $B = \{(t_1, t_2, t_3) : t_1^2 + t_2^2 \leq 1, |t_3| \leq 1\}$.

To search for an alternative formulation of K , it is best to start with the special case F concentrated at 1, for which the identity

$$(4.1) \quad K = E[\sigma_d^{-1}(\{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{R}^d : Y(\mathbf{u}) = 0\})]$$

holds. This identity looks surprising initially because the right hand side involves only the occupation measure of the conditional process Y at 0 and does not seem to be related to the maxima of Y . Is (4.1) true for general F ? Before answering this question, we first show how (4.1) can be utilized to provide a lower bound for K .

EXAMPLE 2. Let F be concentrated at 1. By (4.1), $K \geq \{E[\sigma_d(\{\mathbf{u} : Y(\mathbf{u}) = 0\})]\}^{-1}$. Let $B_d = \{\mathbf{t} : \|\mathbf{t}\| \leq 1\}$ with $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbf{R}^d$ and let $C_d = \sigma_{d-1}(\partial B_d)/\sigma_{d-1}^d(B_{d-1}) = [d\pi^{d/2}/\Gamma(d/2 +$

1)]/ $[\pi^{(d-1)/2}/\Gamma((d+1)/2)]^d$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.2) \quad E[\sigma_d(\{\mathbf{u} : Y(\mathbf{u}) = 0\})] &= C_d \int_0^\infty r^{d-1} \sum_{k=0}^\infty e^{-r(1+c)} [c^k r^{2k}/(k!)^2] dr \\
&= C_d \sum_{k=0}^\infty c^k \Gamma(2k+d)/[(k!)^2(1+c)^{2k+d}] = [C_d/(1+c)^d] f_d^{(d-1)}(\sqrt{c}/(1+c)),
\end{aligned}$$

where $f_\ell(x) = x^\ell/\sqrt{1-4x^2}$ and $g^{(\ell)}$ is the ℓ th derivative of a function g . Similar computations can also be carried out for kernels of other shapes.

THEOREM 2. *Let $c > \max\{0, \mu\sigma_d(B)\}$. Then*

$$(4.3) \quad K = \chi_c^{-1} E\{[(1 - \exp(\theta_c \sup\{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{R}^d : Y(\mathbf{u}) < 0\}))]\sigma_d^{-1}(\{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{R}^d : Y(\mathbf{u}) = 0\})\}$$

where $\chi_c = \eta^{-1}(1 - e^{-\eta\theta_c})$ if F is arithmetic with span η and $\chi_c = \theta_c$ if F is nonarithmetic.

Let $\{(\mathbf{t}(i), y_i) : i \geq 1\}$ be a unit rate Poisson process defined on $\partial B \times [0, \infty)$ and define the random set

$$\Omega = \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{R}^d : \mathbf{n}_{\mathbf{t}(i)} \cdot \mathbf{u} < 0 \text{ or } y_i(\mathbf{n}_{\mathbf{t}(i)} \cdot \mathbf{u}) \geq \|\mathbf{u}\|^2 \text{ for all } i\}.$$

Then $[1 + M(\theta)]^d \sigma_d(\{\mathbf{u} : Y(\mathbf{u}) = 0\}) \Rightarrow \sigma_d(\Omega)$ as $c \rightarrow \infty$. Hence we obtain the following.

COROLLARY 1. *If F is nondegenerate, then $K/\{\chi_c^{-1}[1 + M(\theta_c)]^d\}$ is bounded above by $E[\sigma_d^{-1}(\Omega)]$ for all c and tends towards $E[\sigma_d^{-1}(\Omega)]$ as $c \rightarrow \infty$. If F is degenerate at $\eta > 0$, then $K/[1 + M(\theta_c)]^d$ is bounded above by $\eta E[\sigma_d^{-1}(\Omega)]$ for all c and tends toward $\eta E[\sigma_d^{-1}(\Omega)]$ as $c \rightarrow \infty$.*

The case F degenerate at η stands out because $\sup\{Y(\mathbf{u}) : Y(\mathbf{u}) < 0\} = -\eta$ with probability 1. Note also that Ω depends only on the kernel B and not F .

PROOF OF THEOREM 2. Let us first consider F arithmetic with span 1. To simplify notations, select λ such that $x_\lambda = 0$ (i.e. $\lambda \in \mathbf{Z}/c$). We shall also abuse notation here and write $S(\mathbf{v})$ in place of $S(\mathbf{v} + B)$. By the change of measure argument in the proof of Lemma 1 and the probability bounds obtained in Lemmas A.1 and A.2, for any integers $0 \leq k < \ell$, $\mathbf{t}$ in the interior of D and $dw \in (0, \infty)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.4) \quad P_\lambda \Big\{ \sup_{\mathbf{v} \in D} S(\mathbf{v}) = \lambda c, S(\mathbf{t}) = \lambda c - k, \sigma_d(\{\mathbf{v} : S(\mathbf{v}) = \lambda c - k\}) \in \lambda^{-d} dw, \\
\sup\{S(\mathbf{v}) : S(\mathbf{v}) < S(\mathbf{t})\} = \lambda c - \ell \Big\} \sim [2\pi\lambda\sigma_d(B)M''(\theta_c)]^{-1/2} e^{-\lambda I + \theta_c k} \sigma_d(D) \\
\times P \Big\{ \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{R}^d} Y(\mathbf{u}) = k, \sigma_d(\{\mathbf{u} : Y(\mathbf{u}) = 0\}) \in dw, \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{R}^d} \{Y(\mathbf{u}) : Y(\mathbf{u}) < 0\} = k - \ell \Big\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Multiplying (4.4) by $\lambda^d(e^{-\theta_c k} - e^{-\theta_c \ell})/w$ and integrating over $\mathbf{t} \in D$ and $w > 0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.5) \quad & (e^{-\theta_c k} - e^{-\theta_c \ell}) P_\lambda \left\{ \sup_{\mathbf{v} \in D} S(\mathbf{v}) = \lambda c, \sigma_d(\{\mathbf{v} : S(\mathbf{v}) = \lambda c - k\}) > 0, \right. \\
& \left. \sigma_d(\{\mathbf{v} : S(\mathbf{v}) = \lambda c - \ell\}) > 0, \sigma_d(\{\mathbf{v} : \lambda c - \ell < S(\mathbf{v}) < \lambda c - k\}) = 0 \right\} \\
& \sim [2\pi\sigma_d(B)M''(\theta_c)]^{-1/2} e^{-\lambda I} \lambda^{d-1/2} \sigma_d(D) (1 - e^{\theta_c(k-\ell)}) \\
& \times E \left[\sigma_d^{-1}(\{\mathbf{u} : Y(\mathbf{u}) = 0\}) \mathbf{1}_{\{\sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{R}^d} Y(\mathbf{u}) = k, \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{R}^d} \{Y(\mathbf{u}) : Y(\mathbf{u}) < 0\} = k - \ell\}} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Theorem 2 then follows by adding up (4.5) over the integers $0 \leq k < \ell$ and comparing against

$$(4.6) \quad P_\lambda \left\{ \sup_{\mathbf{v} \in D} S(\mathbf{v} + B) = \lambda c \right\} \sim [2\pi\sigma_d(B)M''(\theta_c)]^{-1/2} (1 - e^{-\theta_c}) e^{-\lambda I} \lambda^{d-1/2} \sigma_d(D) K,$$

a straightforward modification of Theorem 1. For F arithmetic with arbitrary span $\eta > 0$ or F nonarithmetic, the arguments are similar. $\square$

5. A relook at the Poisson clumping heuristic. In this section, we consider a continuous valued random process $X(\mathbf{t})$, $t \in D$. To make the discussion concrete, we pick the isotropic mean zero Gaussian random field $X(\mathbf{t})$, $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbf{R}^d$ satisfying

$$(5.1) \quad E[X(\mathbf{t})X(\mathbf{t} + \mathbf{s})] \sim 1 - a\|\mathbf{s}\|^\alpha \text{ as } \|\mathbf{s}\| \rightarrow 0$$

for some $0 < \alpha \leq 2$ and $0 < a < \infty$. It was shown in Bickel and Rosenblatt (1973) and Qualls and Watanabe (1973) that

$$(5.2) \quad P\{\sup_{\mathbf{t} \in D} X(\mathbf{t}) \geq c\} \sim (2\pi)^{-1/2} c^{2d/\alpha-1} e^{-c^2/2} a^{d/\alpha} \tilde{K} \text{ as } c \rightarrow \infty.$$

The approach is via a conditioning on $X(\mathbf{t}) = c - y/c$ for $y > 0$ which leads to the expression

$$(5.3) \quad \tilde{K} = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} m^{-d} \int_0^\infty e^y P\left\{ \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in [0, m]^d} Y(\mathbf{u}) \geq y \right\} dy,$$

where Y is a Gaussian process satisfying

$$(5.4) \quad EY(\mathbf{u}) = -\|\mathbf{u}\|^\alpha, \quad \text{Cov}(Y(\mathbf{u}), Y(\mathbf{v})) = \|\mathbf{u}\|^\alpha + \|\mathbf{v}\|^\alpha - \|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}\|^\alpha.$$

Aldous (1989) using the Poisson clumping heuristic, conditioned instead on $X(\mathbf{u}) \geq c + y/c$ for $y > 0$ and it follows from this approach that

$$(5.5) \quad \tilde{K} = E[\sigma_d^{-1}(\{Y(\mathbf{u}) : Y(\mathbf{u}) \geq -Z\})],$$

where Z is an independent exponential random variable with mean 1. In Theorem 3, we apply the technique used to prove Theorem 2 to provide a differential form of (5.5).

THEOREM 3. $\tilde{K} = \lim_{\xi \rightarrow 0} \int_0^\xi E[\sigma_d^{-1}(\{\mathbf{u} : -b < Y(\mathbf{u}) \leq \xi - b\})] db$.

EXAMPLE 3. We shall provide lower bounds of $\tilde{K}$ using the harmonic mean inequality as in J20 of Aldous (1989). Let $B = \{\mathbf{t} : \|\mathbf{t}\| \leq 1\}$. By Theorem 3, $\tilde{K} \geq \lim_{\xi \rightarrow 0} \int_0^\xi \{E[\sigma_d(\{\mathbf{u} : -b < Y(\mathbf{u}) \leq \xi - b\})]\}^{-1} db$ and hence

$$\tilde{K}^{-1} \leq \sigma_{d-1}(\partial B) \int_0^\infty r^{d-1} (4\pi r^\alpha)^{-1/2} e^{-r^{2\alpha}/(4r^\alpha)} dr.$$

This leads to the inequality

$$(5.6) \quad \tilde{K} \geq d^{-1} \pi^{(1-d)/2} 4^{1-d/\alpha} \alpha \Gamma\left(\frac{d}{2} + 1\right) / \Gamma\left(\frac{d}{\alpha} - \frac{1}{2}\right).$$

In the case $\alpha = 2$, Y has a simple characterization from which $\tilde{K} = \pi^{-d/2}$ can be computed. For $d = 2$, the right hand side of (5.6) is $\pi^{-1}(=\tilde{K})$ and for $d = 3$, it is $1/(4\sqrt{\pi})$.

PROOF OF THEOREM 3. Let $\xi > 0$, $0 \leq v < \xi$, $X_{\sup} = \sup_{\mathbf{t} \in D} X(\mathbf{t})$ and $Y_{\sup} = \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{R}^d} Y(\mathbf{u})$. For any integer $k \geq 0$, $\mathbf{t}$ in the interior of D and $dw \in (0, \infty)$,

$$(5.7) \quad \begin{aligned} & P\{X_{\sup} \geq c, X_{\sup} - [(k+1)\xi - v]/c < X(\mathbf{t}) \leq X_{\sup} - (k\xi - v)/c, \\ & \sigma_d(\{\mathbf{u} : X_{\sup} - [(k+1)\xi - v]/c < X(\mathbf{u}) \leq X_{\sup} - (k\xi - v)/c\}) \in (c^2 a)^{-d/\alpha} dw\} \\ & \sim (2\pi)^{-1/2} c^{-1} e^{-c^2/2} \left\{ \left(\int_{-(k\xi-v)}^\infty e^{-y} dy \right) P\{k\xi - v \leq Y_{\sup} < (k+1)\xi - v, \right. \\ & \sigma_d(\{\mathbf{u} : Y_{\sup} - [(k+1)\xi - v] < Y(\mathbf{u}) \leq Y_{\sup} - (k\xi - v)\}) \in dw\} \\ & + \int_{-[(k+1)\xi-v]}^{-(k\xi-v)} e^{-y} P\{y \leq Y_{\sup} < (k+1)\xi - v, \\ & \left. \sigma_d(\{\mathbf{u} : Y_{\sup} - [(k+1)\xi - c] < Y(\mathbf{u}) \leq Y_{\sup} - (k\xi - c)\}) \in dw\} dy \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Multiply (5.7) by $(e^{-k\xi} - e^{-(k+1)\xi})/[(c^2 a)^{-d/\alpha} w]$, then integrating over $\mathbf{t} \in D$ and $w > 0$ and add over $k \geq 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k=0}^\infty (e^{-k\xi} - e^{-(k+1)\xi}) P\{X_{\sup} \geq c\} \\ & \sim (2\pi)^{-1/2} c^{2d/\alpha-1} a^{d/\alpha} e^{-c^2/2} \left\{ (e^{-v} - e^{-v-\xi}) \sum_{k=0}^\infty E[\mathbf{1}_{\{k\xi-v \leq Y_{\sup} < (k+1)\xi-v\}}] \right. \\ & \left. \times \sigma_d^{-1}(\{\mathbf{u} : Y_{\sup} - [(k+1)\xi - v] < Y(\mathbf{u}) \leq Y_{\sup} - (k\xi - v)\}) + o_\xi(1) \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $o_\xi(1) \rightarrow 0$ as $\xi \rightarrow 0$. By (5.2),

$$(5.8) \quad \tilde{K} = \lim_{\xi \rightarrow 0} \int_0^\xi E[\sigma_d^{-1}(\{\mathbf{u} : Y_{\sup} - (\xi \lfloor (Y_{\sup} + v)/\xi \rfloor - v - \xi) < Y(\mathbf{u}) \leq Y_{\sup} - (\xi \lfloor (Y_{\sup} + v)/\xi \rfloor - v)\})] dv$$

and Theorem 3 is shown. $\square$

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank an associate editor and a referee for their valuable comments and reference.

APPENDIX: PROOF OF THEOREM 1

Let $J = [0, 1]^d$, $\underline{C}_a = \{\mathbf{k} \in (a\mathbf{Z})^d : \mathbf{k} + aJ \subset D\}$ and $\overline{C}_a = \{\mathbf{k} \in (a\mathbf{Z})^d : \mathbf{k} + aJ \cap D \neq \emptyset\}$. Then $\{\mathbf{k} + aJ : \mathbf{k} \in \underline{C}_a\}$ and $\{\mathbf{k} + aJ : \mathbf{k} \in \overline{C}_a\}$ are lower and upper coverings of D respectively by cubes of length a . We shall show via Lemmas A.1 and A.2 that

$$(A.1) \quad \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \left[\sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \underline{C}_{m\lambda^{-1}}} P_\lambda \left\{ \bigcup_{\mathbf{w} \in \underline{C}_{m\lambda^{-1}} : \mathbf{w} \neq \mathbf{u}} (E_{\mathbf{u}, m, \lambda} \cap E_{\mathbf{w}, m, \lambda}) \right\} / (\lambda^{d-1/2} e^{-\lambda I}) \right] = 0.$$

Let $f(\lambda) = [2\pi\sigma_d(B)M''(\theta_c)]^{-1/2} \lambda^{d-1/2} e^{-\lambda I + x_\lambda}$. Then by Lemma 1,

$$(A.2) \quad P_\lambda(E_{\mathbf{u}, m, \lambda}) \sim K_m f(\lambda) / \lambda^d \text{ as } \lambda \rightarrow \infty.$$

Given $\epsilon > 0$, let m_ϵ be large enough such that for all $m \geq m_\epsilon$, the expression in the square brackets on the left-hand side of (A.1) does not exceed ϵ for all large λ . Then by (A.2), for all $m \geq m_\epsilon$,

$$(A.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \liminf_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} [\lambda^{-d} (\#\underline{C}_{m/\lambda}) K_m - \epsilon \lambda^{d-1/2} e^{-\lambda I} / f(\lambda)] &\leq \liminf_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} [p_\lambda / f(\lambda)] \\ &\leq \limsup_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} [p_\lambda / f(\lambda)] \leq \limsup_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} [\lambda^{-d} (\#\overline{C}_{m/\lambda}) K_m]. \end{aligned}$$

Since D is Jordan-measurable,

$$(A.4) \quad \#\underline{C}_a \sim \#\overline{C}_a \sim a^{-d} \sigma_d(D) \text{ as } a \rightarrow 0.$$

Noting that $\liminf_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} [p_\lambda / f(\lambda)]$ and $\limsup_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} [p_\lambda / f(\lambda)]$ are fixed real numbers and x_λ is bounded, it follows from (A.3) and (A.4) that $m^{-d} K_m$ is Cauchy. Hence $K = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} m^{-d} K_m$ exists and (3.12) follows from (A.3).

We will now state and prove Lemmas A.1 and A.2 before providing the complete proofs of both (A.1) and Theorem 1. To avoid repetitive arguments, we will state and prove all subsequent results assuming F is arithmetic with span 1. The modifications required to extend these results to arbitrary F are relatively straightforward and will not be discussed.

LEMMA A.1.

$$(A.5) \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \left[P_\lambda \{ S(B) < \lfloor \lambda c \rfloor - r, \sup_{\mathbf{0} \prec \mathbf{v} \prec \lambda^{-1} \mathbf{1}} S(\mathbf{v} + B) \geq \lfloor \lambda c \rfloor \} / (\lambda^{-1/2} e^{-\lambda I}) \right] = 0.$$

PROOF. By (3.8) with $m = 1$ and the weak convergence of $S(\lambda^{-1}\mathbf{u} + B) - S(B)$ to $Y(\mathbf{u})$ under Q_λ ,

$$(A.6) \quad \begin{aligned} & P_\lambda \{S(B) < \lfloor \lambda c \rfloor - r, \sup_{\mathbf{0} \prec \mathbf{v} \prec \lambda^{-1} \mathbf{1}} S(\mathbf{v} + B) \geq \lfloor \lambda c \rfloor\} \\ & \sim [2\pi\lambda\sigma_d(B)M''(\theta_c)]^{-1/2} e^{-\lambda I + x_\lambda} \sum_{\ell=r+1}^{\infty} e^{\theta_c \ell} P\left\{\sup_{\mathbf{0} \prec \mathbf{u} \prec \mathbf{1}} Y(\mathbf{u}) \geq \ell\right\} \text{ as } \lambda \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Let $x^+ = \max\{x, 0\}$ and $x^- = \max\{-x, 0\}$. It follows from (2.3) and (2.4) that

$$(A.7) \quad \sup_{\mathbf{0} \prec \mathbf{u} \prec \mathbf{1}} Y(\mathbf{u}) \leq Z^* := \sum_{i: \mathbf{v}_i^{(1)} \in A^{(1)}} [Z_i^{(1)}]^+ + \sum_{i: \mathbf{v}_i^{(2)} \in A^{(2)}} [Z_i^{(2)}]^-,$$

where $A^{(1)} = \partial B \times [0, d^{1/2})$ and $A^{(2)} = \partial B \times [-d^{-1/2}, 0)$. We can also express $Z^* = \sum_{j=1}^N V_j$, where N is a Poisson random variable with mean $\kappa := 1 - F(0) + M(\theta_c)F_c(0)$ and $V_1, V_2, \dots$ are i.i.d. random variables independent of N with $g := Ee^{\tilde{\theta}V_1} < \infty$ for some $\tilde{\theta} > \theta_c$. Since $Ee^{\tilde{\theta}Z^*} = e^{\kappa(g-1)}$, it follows from Chebyshev's inequality that $P\{Z^* \geq \ell\} \leq e^{\kappa(g-1) - \tilde{\theta}\ell}$. Hence by (A.7),

$$(A.8) \quad \sum_{\ell=r+1}^{\infty} e^{\theta_c \ell} P_\lambda \left\{ \sup_{\mathbf{0} \prec \mathbf{u} \prec \mathbf{1}} Y(\mathbf{u}) \geq \ell \right\} = O(e^{\kappa(g-1) - (\tilde{\theta} - \theta_c)r}).$$

Lemma 2 follows from (A.6), (A.8) and because x_λ is bounded. $\square$

LEMMA A.2. *Let $r \geq 0$ and $L > 0$ be given. Then*

$$(A.9) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \left[\sum_{\mathbf{v} \in (\lambda^{-1} \mathbf{Z})^d: k\lambda^{-1} \leq \|\mathbf{v}\|_\infty \leq L} P_\lambda \{S(B) \geq \lfloor \lambda c \rfloor - r, S(\mathbf{v} + B) \geq \lfloor \lambda c \rfloor - r\} / (\lambda^{-1/2} e^{-\lambda I}) \right] = 0.$$

PROOF. Let $\tilde{Q}_\lambda (= \tilde{Q}_{\lambda, \mathbf{v}})$ be the probability measure under which the marked Poisson process $\mathbf{X}$ has Poisson rate $\lambda M(\theta_c)$ on $B_1 := B \cap (\mathbf{v} + B)$, rate $\lambda M(\theta_c/2)$ on $B_2 := (B \setminus (\mathbf{v} + B)) \cup ((\mathbf{v} + B) \setminus B)$ and rate λ elsewhere on $\mathbf{R}^d$. Moreover we require that under $\tilde{Q}_\lambda$, the marks have distribution F_c on B_1 , distribution $\tilde{F}$ satisfying $\tilde{F}(dx) = e^{\theta_c x/2} F(dx) / M(\theta_c/2)$ on B_2 and F elsewhere on $\mathbf{R}^d$. Then

$$(A.10) \quad \frac{d\tilde{Q}_\lambda}{dP_\lambda}(\mathbf{X}) = \left(\prod_{i: \mathbf{t}_i \in B_1} e^{\theta_c X_i} \right) e^{-\lambda \sigma_d(B_1)[M(\theta_c)-1]} \left(\prod_{i: \mathbf{t}_i \in B_2} e^{\theta_c X_i/2} \right) e^{-\lambda \sigma_d(B_2)[M(\theta_c/2)-1]}.$$

Since M is a convex function and $M(0) = 1$, $\zeta := [M(\theta_c) - 1] - 2[M(\theta_c/2) - 1] > 0$. We can thus express (A.10) as

$$\frac{d\tilde{Q}_\lambda}{dP_\lambda}(\mathbf{X}) = e^{(\theta_c/2)[S(B)+S(\mathbf{v}+B)] - \lambda[\sigma_d(B)+\sigma_d(\mathbf{v}+B)][M(\theta_c)-1]/2 + \lambda\zeta\sigma_d(B_2)/2},$$

and it follows from (3.2) and an analogue of (3.7) that

$$(A.11) \quad \begin{aligned} P_\lambda\{S(B) \geq \lfloor \lambda c \rfloor - r, S(\mathbf{v} + B) \geq \lfloor \lambda c \rfloor - r\} &\leq P_\lambda\{S(B) + S(\mathbf{v} + B) \geq 2(\lfloor \lambda c \rfloor - r)\} \\ &= E_{\tilde{Q}_\lambda} \left[\frac{dP_\lambda}{d\tilde{Q}_\lambda} \mathbf{1}_{\{S(B) + S(\mathbf{v} + B) \geq 2(\lfloor \lambda c \rfloor - r)\}} \right] = O(e^{-\lambda I - \lambda \zeta \sigma_d(B \setminus (\mathbf{v} + B))} \lambda^{-1/2}). \end{aligned}$$

Let $\|\mathbf{e}\| = 1$ and $\Pi_{\mathbf{e}} = \{\mathbf{b} - (\mathbf{e} \cdot \mathbf{b})\mathbf{e} : \mathbf{b} \in B\}$ the projected surface of B on a $(d-1)$ -dimensional hyperplane orthogonal to $\mathbf{e}$. Then $\beta := \inf_{\|\mathbf{e}\|=1} \sigma_{d-1}(\Pi_{\mathbf{e}}) > 0$. Hence there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$(A.12) \quad \sigma_d(B \setminus (\mathbf{v} + B)) \geq \|\mathbf{v}\|\beta/2 \geq \|\mathbf{v}\|_\infty \beta/2 \text{ for all } \|\mathbf{v}\|_\infty \leq \epsilon.$$

By (A.11) and (A.12), it follows that

$$(A.13) \quad \begin{aligned} &\sum_{\mathbf{v} \in (\lambda^{-1}\mathbf{Z})^d : k\lambda^{-1} \leq \|\mathbf{v}\|_\infty \leq \epsilon} P_\lambda\{S(B) \geq \lfloor \lambda c \rfloor - r, S(\mathbf{v} + B) \geq \lfloor \lambda c \rfloor - r\} \\ &= O\left(\lambda^{-1/2} e^{-\lambda I} \sum_{\ell \geq k} \ell^{d-1} e^{-\zeta \ell \beta/2}\right) = O(\lambda^{-1/2} e^{-\lambda I} k^{d-1} e^{-\zeta k \beta/2}). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, since $\alpha := \inf_{\|\mathbf{v}\|_\infty > \epsilon} \sigma_d(B \setminus (\mathbf{v} + B)) > 0$, it follows from (A.11) that

$$(A.14) \quad \sum_{\mathbf{v} \in (\lambda^{-1}\mathbf{Z})^d : \epsilon < \|\mathbf{v}\|_\infty \leq L} P_\lambda\{S(B) \geq \lfloor \lambda c \rfloor - r, S(\mathbf{v} + B) \geq \lfloor \lambda c \rfloor - r\} = O(\lambda^{d-1/2} e^{-\lambda I - \lambda \zeta \alpha}).$$

Lemma 3 then follows from combining (A.13) and (A.14). $\square$

PROOF OF (A.1). Let $\epsilon > 0$. By Lemma A.1 and stationarity, we can select r large enough such that

$$(A.15) \quad \gamma_{\mathbf{u}, \lambda} := P_\lambda\{S(\mathbf{u} + B) < \lfloor \lambda c \rfloor - r, \sup_{\mathbf{u} \prec \mathbf{v} \prec \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{1}} S(\mathbf{v} + B) \geq \lfloor \lambda c \rfloor\} \leq \epsilon \lambda^{-1/2} e^{-\lambda I}$$

for all large λ . Let $k = \lfloor m^{1/2} \rfloor$, $\Gamma_m = \{\mathbf{t} \in \mathbf{Z}^d : k\mathbf{1} \prec \mathbf{t} \prec (m-k)\mathbf{1}\}$ and $\Omega_m = \{\mathbf{t} \in \mathbf{Z}^d : \mathbf{0} \prec \mathbf{t} \prec m\mathbf{1}\} \setminus \Gamma_m$. Then

$$(A.16) \quad \begin{aligned} &\sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \underline{C}_{m\lambda-1}} P_\lambda \left\{ \bigcup_{\mathbf{w} \in \underline{C}_{m\lambda-1} : \mathbf{w} \neq \mathbf{u}} (E_{\mathbf{u}, m, \lambda} \cap E_{\mathbf{w}, m, \lambda}) \right\} \\ &\leq \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \underline{C}_{\lambda-1}} \gamma_{\mathbf{u}, \lambda} + \sum_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w} \in \underline{C}_{m\lambda-1} : \mathbf{w} \neq \mathbf{u}} P_\lambda(G_{\mathbf{u}, m, \lambda} \cap G_{\mathbf{w}, m, \lambda}) + \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \underline{C}_{m\lambda-1}} P_\lambda(H_{\mathbf{u}, m, \lambda}), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$(A.17) \quad G_{\mathbf{u}, m, \lambda} = P_\lambda\{S(\mathbf{v} + B) \geq \lfloor \lambda c \rfloor - r \text{ for some } \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{u} + \lambda^{-1}\Gamma_m\},$$

$$(A.18) \quad H_{\mathbf{u},m,\lambda} = P_\lambda\{S(\mathbf{v} + B) \geq \lfloor \lambda c \rfloor - r \text{ for some } \mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{u} + \lambda^{-1}\Omega_m\}.$$

By (A.4) and (A.15),

$$(A.19) \quad \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \underline{C}_{\lambda^{-1}}} \gamma_{\mathbf{u},\lambda} \leq [\epsilon + o(1)] \lambda^{d-1/2} e^{-\lambda I} \sigma_d(D).$$

Let $L > \sup_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in D} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|_\infty$. Then by (A.17), stationarity and Lemma A.2, there exists m large enough such that for all $\mathbf{u} \in \underline{C}_{m\lambda^{-1}}$ and large λ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \underline{C}_{m\lambda^{-1}} : \mathbf{w} \neq \mathbf{u}} P_\lambda(G_{\mathbf{u},m,\lambda} \cap G_{\mathbf{w},m,\lambda}) \\ & \leq m^d \sum_{\mathbf{v} \in (\lambda^{-1}\mathbf{Z})^d : k\lambda^{-1} \leq \|\mathbf{v}\|_\infty \leq L} P_\lambda\{S(B) \geq \lfloor \lambda c \rfloor - r, S(\mathbf{v} + B) \geq \lfloor \lambda c \rfloor - r\} \leq [\epsilon + o(1)] m^d \lambda^{-1/2} e^{-\lambda I}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence by (A.4),

$$(A.20) \quad \sum_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{w} \in \underline{C}_{m\lambda^{-1}} : \mathbf{w} \neq \mathbf{u}} P_\lambda(G_{\mathbf{u},m,\lambda} \cap G_{\mathbf{w},m,\lambda}) \leq \sigma_d(D) [\epsilon + o(1)] \lambda^{d-1/2} e^{-\lambda I}.$$

Since $k = \lfloor m^{1/2} \rfloor$, $\#\Omega_m = (m+1)^d - (m+1-2k)^d = O(m^{d-1/2})$ and it follows from (A.4) and a modification of (3.10) (with $\sum_{\ell=-\infty}^r$ instead of $\sum_{\ell=-\infty}^0$) that

$$(A.21) \quad \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \underline{C}_{m\lambda^{-1}}} P_\lambda(H_{\mathbf{u},m,\lambda}) = O(m^{d-1/2} (\lambda m^{-1})^d \sigma_d(D) \lambda^{-1/2} e^{-\lambda I}) \leq \epsilon \lambda^{d-1/2} e^{-\lambda I} \sigma_d(D)$$

for all large m . We then obtain (A.1) from (A.16) and (A.19)-(A.21) by choosing ϵ arbitrarily small. $\square$

PROOF OF THEOREM 1. By the arguments in the beginning of Section 4, it remains to show that K is positive and finite. By Lemma A.1, there exists r large enough such that

$$(A.22) \quad P_\lambda\{S(B) < \lfloor \lambda c \rfloor - r, \sup_{\mathbf{0} \prec \mathbf{v} \prec \lambda^{-1}\mathbf{1}} S(\mathbf{v} + B) \geq \lfloor \lambda c \rfloor\} \leq \lambda^{-1/2} e^{-\lambda I}$$

for all large λ . Moreover, by a modification of (3.10) (with $\sum_{\ell=-\infty}^r$ instead of $\sum_{\ell=-\infty}^0$),

$$(A.23) \quad P_\lambda\{S(B) \geq \lfloor \lambda c \rfloor - r\} = O(\lambda^{-1/2} e^{-\lambda I}).$$

By adding up (A.22), (A.23) and applying Lemma 1, we can conclude that $K_1 < \infty$. Then by (3.12), (A.3) and (A.4), $K \leq K_1 < \infty$.

Next, select ϵ small enough such that $\delta := [2\pi\sigma_d(B)M''(\theta_c)]^{-1/2} \sum_{\ell=-\infty}^0 e^{\theta_c \ell} - \epsilon > 0$. By Lemma A.2 with $r = 0$ and $L > \sup_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in D} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|_\infty$, there exists k large enough such that

$$(A.24) \quad \sum_{\mathbf{v} \in (k\lambda^{-1}\mathbf{Z})^d : 0 < \|\mathbf{v}\|_\infty \leq L} P_\lambda\{S(B) \geq \lfloor \lambda c \rfloor, S(\mathbf{v} + B) \geq \lfloor \lambda c \rfloor\} \leq \epsilon \lambda^{-1/2} e^{-\lambda I}$$

for all large λ . Then by stationarity, (3.10) and (A.24), noting that $x_\lambda \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
P_\lambda(E_{\mathbf{0},m,\lambda}) &\geq P_\lambda\{S(\mathbf{u} + B) \geq \lfloor \lambda c \rfloor \text{ for some } \mathbf{u} \in (k\lambda^{-1}\mathbf{Z})^d, \mathbf{0} \prec \mathbf{u} \prec m\lambda^{-1}\mathbf{1}\} \\
&\geq \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in (k\lambda^{-1}\mathbf{Z})^d: \mathbf{0} \prec \mathbf{u} \prec m\lambda^{-1}\mathbf{1}} \left(P_\lambda\{S(\mathbf{u} + B) \geq \lfloor \lambda c \rfloor\} \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in (k\lambda^{-1}\mathbf{Z})^d: 0 < \|\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{u}\|_\infty \leq L} P\{S(\mathbf{u} + B) \geq \lfloor \lambda c \rfloor, S(\mathbf{w} + B) \geq \lfloor \lambda c \rfloor\} \right) \\
&\geq (m/k)^d \delta \lambda^{-1/2} e^{-\lambda I} \text{ for all large } \lambda,
\end{aligned}$$

and by letting $m \rightarrow \infty$ with k fixed, it follows from (3.3), (3.11) and x_λ bounded that $K > 0$.

□

REFERENCES

- ADLER, R. (2000). On excursion sets, tube formulas and maxima of random field. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* **10** 1-74.
- ALBIN, J.M.P. (1990). On extremal theory for stationary processes. *Ann. Probab.* **18** 92-128.
- ALDOUS, D. (1989). *Probability Approximations via the Poisson clumping heuristic*. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- ALM, S.E. (1997). On the distribution of scan statistics of a two-dimensional Poisson process. *Adv. Appl. Probab.* **29** 1-18.
- ANDERSON, N.H. and TITTERINGTON, D.M. (1997). Some methods for investigating spatial clustering with epidemiological applications. *JRSS 'A'* **160** 87-105.
- BERMAN, S.M. (1982). Sojourns and extremes of stationary processes. *Ann. Probab.* **10** 1-46.
- BICKEL, P. and ROSENBLATT, M. (1973). Two-dimensional random field. In *Multivariate Analysis III* (P.R. Krishnaiah, ed.) 3-15. Academic, New York.
- CHAN, H.P. and LAI, T.L. (2006). Maxima of asymptotically Gaussian random fields and moderate deviation approximations to boundary-crossing probabilities of sums of random variables with multidimensional indices. *Ann. Probab.* **34** 80-121.
- CHAN, H.P. and ZHANG, N.R. (2007). Scan statistics with weighted observations. *Jour. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, **102** 595-602.
- CRESSIE, N. (1993). *Statistics for Spatial Data*. Wiley, New York.
- FELLER, W. (1971). *An Introduction to Probability Theory and its Applications*, Vol 2. Wiley, New York.

- GLAZ, J., NAUS, J. and WALLENSTEIN, S. (2001). *Scan Statistics*. Springer, New York.
- HOGAN, M. and SIEGMUND, D.O. (1986). Large deviations for the maxima of some random fields. *Adv. Appl. Math.* **7** 2-22.
- LOADER, C. (1991). Large-deviation approximation to the distribution of scan statistics. *Adv. Appl. Probab.* **23** 751-771.
- NAUS, J.I. (1965). Clustering of random points in two dimensions. *Biometrika* **52** 263-267.
- PICKANDS, J. (1969). Upcrossing probabilities for stationary Gaussian processes. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **145** 51-75.
- PITERBARG, V. (1996). *Asymptotic Methods in the Theory of Gaussian Processes and Fields*. Transl. vol 148, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence.
- QUALLS, C. and WATANABE, H. (1973). Asymptotic properties of Gaussian random fields. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **177** 155-171.
- SHAFIE, K., SIGAL, B., SIEGMUND, D and WORSLEY, K.J. (2003). Rotation space random fields with an application to fMRI data. *Ann. Statist.* **31** 1732-1771.
- SIEGMUND, D.O. (1985). *Sequential Analysis*. Springer, New York.
- SIEGMUND, D.O. and WORSLEY, K.J. (1995). Testing for a signal with unknown location and scale in a stationary Gaussian random field. *Ann. Statist.* **23** 608-639.
- SPIVAK, M. (1965). *Calculus on Manifold: A Modern Approach to Classical Theorem of Advanced Calculus*. W.A. Benjamin, New York.
- TAYLOR, J. (2006). A Gaussian kinematic formula. *Ann. Probab.* **34** 122-158.
- TAYLOR, J., TAKEMURA, A. and ADLER, R. (2005). Validity of the expected Euler characteristic heuristic. *Ann. Probab.* **33** 1362-1396.